

### REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application, with claims 1-8 being independent. Claims 1-3 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 5-8 and 19-21.

Applicant notes that, though the office action summary indicates that the PTO-1449 from the information disclosure statement filed May 30, 2003, was attached, no copy of the PTO-1449 was actually provided. Please provide an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 with the next communication regarding this application.

Claims 1-3, 10, 14 and 16 have been rejected as being anticipated by Yap. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Yap does not describe or suggest a first electrode and a second electrode that are formed on a common insulator, as recited in each of independent claims 1-3. In particular, with reference to Fig. 3A of Yap, the electrode 62, which the Examiner has equated to the second electrode recited in claims 1-3, is not formed on the dielectric layer 52, which the Examiner has equated to the insulator recited in claims 1-3.

Claims 1-4, 9 and 16 have been rejected as being anticipated by Yamada. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Yamada does not describe or suggest first and second electrodes that are formed on a common insulator, as recited in each of independent claims 1-4. In particular, with reference to Fig. 4B of Yamada, the electrodes 61 and 67, which the Examiner has equated to the first and second electrodes recited in claims 1-4, are not formed on either of the insulators 15 and 32, which the Examiner has equated to the insulator recited in claims 1-4.

Claims 1 and 11 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Nagayama in view of Yamada. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Nagayama, like Yamada, does not describe or suggest electrodes that are formed on a common insulator, as recited in independent claim 1. In particular, with reference to Fig. 3 of Nagayama, the electrodes 6 and 9, which the Examiner has equated to the first and second electrodes recited

in claim 1, are not both formed on the insulating layer of the thin film transistor array, which the Examiner has equated to the insulator recited in claim 1.

Claims 12 and 22, which depend from claim 1, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Nagayama in view of Yamada and Haynes. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Haynes does not remedy the failure of Nagayama and Yamada to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 1.

Claim 9, which depends from claims 1-4, has been rejected as being unpatentable over Yap. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 1-3, 10, 14 and 16 as being anticipated by Yap.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$420 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 6, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

**Customer No. 26171**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331